



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 10

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Catherine Fischer Appl. rep. (3) _____
(2) Jeff Aftergut (4) _____

Date of Interview 12-8-99

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: ~~see~~ brochure which shows what Nordson "Control Coat" is.

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: Boger, Santtleben et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed how Boger utilized a solvent based adhesive and not a hot melt adhesive. Discussed the declaration and how it was believed that the "Control Coat" device was employed in Boger. Disagreed as to whether this was correct or not and proposed to find more information (from Nordson) regarding the same. Noted that the reference to Santtleben suggested using hot melt coatings and the extrusion of the same and noted that the use of the device if Boger would have been obvious. Appl. rep. indicated that evidence relating to the viscosity of the hot melts of Santtleben might be forthcoming.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

JEFF H. AFTERGUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300